- 1 Wo Of Ideafarm
- 2 211 Hope Street, #276
- 3 Mountain View, CA 94042
- 4 (650) 804-1311
- 5 Plaintiff, pro se
- 6 Notice: Electronic service accepted at
- 7 ideafarmcity@gmail.com

OCT 2 6 2016

SUSAN Y. SOONG
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

O.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

10 IdeaFarm, Wo Of

11 Plaintiff

12 **v**.

14

9

13 Mountain View Police Dept., et al

Defendant





- 1. Jurisdiction: This complaint is pursuant to 42. U.S.C. 1983 and to the Due
- 16 Process Clause, the First Amendment, and the Fourth Amendment to the United States
- 17 Constitution.
- 18 2. Venue: All parties reside or work in this district. All of the acts and omissions
- 19 occurred within this district.
- 20 3. Intradistrict Assignment: This suit should be assigned to the San Jose Division
- 21 because all parties reside or work within, and all acts and omissions occurred within,
- 22 Mountain View, CA.
- 23 4. Plaintiff Wo Of Ideafarm wants to be, but is prevented from being, a sign holding

- speaker of ideas about the upcoming Presidential Election on November 8, 2016.
- 2 5. Agency Defendant: Mountain View Police Department (of the City of Mountain
- 3 View, CA), hereafter MVPD. 1000 Villa Street, Mountain View, CA 94041; (650) 903-
- 4 6395. Attorney: Jannie Quinn, City Attorney, 500 Castro Street, 3rd Floor, City Hall,
- 5 Mountain View, CA 94041; (650) 903-6303.

• •

6 Individual Defendants: Officer S. Nelson, N2034. Officer T. Low.

STATEMENT OF FACTS – SUMMARY

- 8 Defendant Mountain View Police Department (MVPD) is preventing Plaintiff Wo Of
- 9 Ideafarm from speaking by holding a sign and using a 15-watt megaphone while
- standing as a pedestrian on the roadway or sidewalk on a public street (El Camino
- 11 Real at Castro Street). MVPD is silencing Plaintiff by (1) abusing State Court process
- under color of the authority of California Vehicle Code 21954(a) and California Penal
- Code 370/372 (public nuisance), and, when citing PC 370/372, by (2) arresting,
- 14 imprisoning, and prosecuting without probable cause and without adequate notice
- 15 regarding what is and is not permitted by State law. Plaintiff's speech is also chilled by
- 16 willful intimidation by an MVPD officer that has used force and violence, including the
- 17 intentional infliction of pain and fear, when seizing Plaintiff's person when there was no
- 18 resistance to the arrest. All four incidents were recorded by multiple video cameras,
- including police body cameras, and by an audio recorder worn by Plaintiff.

20 STATEMENT OF FACTS - DETAILS (VERIFIED DECLARATION)

- 1 The undersigned Plaintiff Wo Of Ideafarm declares under penalty of perjury under the
- 2 laws of the State of California that:
- 3 1. Every day between now and Election Day, from 3 PM to sunset, I want to be a
- 4 pedestrian on either the roadway or the sidewalk, at my option, at El Camino Real at
- 5 Castro Street holding a sign displaying a political message to motorists passing
- 6 through the intersection or queued waiting for green traffic control signals, and using a
- 7 15-watt megaphone to speak my sentiments.
- 8 2. When I am standing on the roadway, I am not violating any Vehicle Code provision
- 9 and, in particular, I obey VC 21954(a). When I use my 15-watt megaphone, I am not
- 10 violating any Mountain View ordinance.
- 11 3. I began my "speech operation" on October 16, 2016, but MVPD officers have
- 12 interfered by unreasonably issuing four notices to appear without probable cause, by
- arresting me twice¹ at approximately 6 PM, and by unlawfully transporting me to San
- 14 Jose Main Jail where I was, on both occasions, unlawfully imprisoned until 2 AM in the
- 15 first incident and until 9 PM in the second incident. (No PC 853.6 exception was
- 16 claimed.)
- 17 4. An MVPD sergeant told me that the only way that I can avoid Penal Code 370/372
- arrest and prosecution is "by leaving" and that, in particular, refraining from using the
- 19 megaphone would not suffice.

¹ Oct. 19, 2016: MVPD case 1606840. Oct. 23, 2016: MVPD case 1606938.

- 5. During the second arrest, the transporting MVPD officer told me that the arresting
- 2 officer did not personally observe probable cause but rather that the basis for the arrest
- 3 was that 911 dispatch had received numerous complaints that my speech was
- 4 "bothering" people and that the arresting officer made the arrest on the order of a
- 5 supervising sergeant who was no longer at the scene.
- 6 6. MVPD officers refused to tell me what time, place, manner restrictions I must
- 7 conform to in order to avoid arrest for Penal Code 370/372. During both PC 370
- 8 arrests, the arresting officer refused to state probable cause, which for public nuisance
- 9 is (1) an act, (2) a factual context, and (3) a public right that the act tends to interfere
- with unreasonably. (McDonald (2006)²)
- 7. During the first arrest, which I did not resist, I suffered excessive force and violence,
- including the intentional infliction of pain as an officer twisted my arm at the wrist to the
- point where I feared that my arm would break at the elbow.
- 14 8. I would resume speaking but am in great fear of more violence and imprisonment.
- 15 9. During the most recent arrest, MVPD officers seized my two megaphones "as
- 16 evidence" and maliciously damaged my sign structurally.
- 17 10. All of these four incidents were recorded by one video camera mounted on a tripod
- 18 plus two video cameras mounted on a bicycle helmet that I was wearing, plus an audio

² People v. McDonald, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 422 - Cal: Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate Dist., 2nd Div. 2006.

- 1 recorder that I was wearing on my chest, and in every incident I was told by a police
- 2 officer that all officers involved in the incident, including the transport officers, were
- 3 wearing body cameras that were recording.
- 4 11. In any confrontation with police, I always suffer fear of being killed because on two
- 5 prior occasions law enforcement officers have drawn their weapons on me.
- 6 12. I have been totally silenced by these fears and by the expectation that any attempt
- 7 to speak will result in more violence and imprisonment and the confiscation or
- 8 destruction of my speech equipment.
- 9 13. The election is only 7 days away. Every day that passes with Plaintiff silenced is
- 10 an irreparable loss. If I cannot obtain relief immediately, I will have no choice but to
- 11 resume speaking, which will likely result in more charges, more imprisonment, more
- danger of violence and pain, more silencing, and more destruction or confiscation of
- 13 my speech equipment.
- 14. If the Court denies relief, the likely outcome will be that I will be silenced from now
- through November 8 and will spend most of those days, and beyond, imprisoned, and
- will suffer legal jeopardy and the other burdens of additional criminal public nuisance
- 17 charges.

18 Signed,

19

Wo Of Ideafain

Date

10/28/2016

- 1 In support of the declaration, four notices to appear and two "Pre Booking Information
- 2 Sheet" forms are attached as exhibits.

CLAIMS

3

- 4 Count 1: In violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983, on October 16, 2016, at approximately 1736.
- 5 Officer S. Nelson deprived Plaintiff of his right to speak and to freedom of movement
- 6 and to suffer legal jeopardy without probable cause, by executing a notice to appear for
- 7 an infraction violation of California Vehicle Code 21954(a) without probable cause.
- 8 Count 2: In violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983, on October 16, 2016, at approximately 1755,
- 9 Officer S. Nelson deprived Plaintiff of his right to speak and to freedom of movement
- and to suffer legal jeopardy without probable cause by executing a notice to appear for
- an infraction violation of California Vehicle Code 21954(a) without probable cause.
- 12 Count 3: In violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983, on October 19, 2016, at approximately 1809,
- 13 Officer T. Low deprived Plaintiff of his right to speak and to freedom of movement and
- 14 to be free of unreasonable searches and seizure of his property and person by
- 15 executing a notice to appear for a misdemeanor violation of California Penal Code
- 16 370/372 (public nuisance) without probable cause and without adequate notice of what
- 17 the law does and does not allow. Contrary to both State (Penal Code 853.6) and
- 18 Federal Law (Fourth Amendment), Plaintiff's person was searched and seized,
- 19 transported from Mountain View to San Jose Main Jail, and imprisoned until 2 AM the

- 1 next day.
- 2 **Count 4:** In violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983, on October 19, 2016, at approximately 1809,
- 3 Officer T.Low battered Plaintiff by applying nonlethal force in an arrest in which Plaintiff
- 4 did not resist and by using nonlethal force to willfully and with malice inflict pain by
- 5 twisting Plaintiff's arm with enough force to nearly break Plaintiff's arm at the elbow.
- 6 Count 5: In violation of 42 U.S.C. 1983, on October 23, 2016, at approximately 1707,
- 7 Officer S. Nelson deprived Plaintiff of his right to speak by unreasonably executing a
- 8 notice to appear for a misdemeanor violation of California Penal Code 370/372 (public
- 9 nuisance) without probable cause and without adequate notice of what the law does
- and does not allow. Contrary to both State (Penal Code 853.6) and Federal Law
- 11 (Fourth Amendment), Plaintiff's person was searched and seized, transported from
- Mountain View to San Jose Main Jail, and imprisoned until 9 PM.

13 REQUEST FOR RELIEF

- 14 1. Plaintiff seeks immediate emergency temporary injunctive relief so that he can
- 15 speak during the seven days that remain before the Presidential Election. Time is of
- 16 the essence.
- 2. Plaintiff also seeks monetary damages of \$6000, which is the total of \$1000 per
- each of two infraction "cite and releases" without probable cause plus \$2000 per each
- 19 of two misdemeanor arrests, imprisonments, and prosecutions without probable cause.

1 Signed,

Word Jolep 10/28/2016

Wo Of Ideafarm

Date